



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,242	01/14/2005	Miki Ogawa	03500.017473.	7202

5514 7590 10/07/2008
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

EMPIE, NATHAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1792

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/07/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/521,242	Applicant(s) OGAWA, MIKI	
	Examiner NATHAN H. EMPIE	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/14/05, 9/29/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I (Claims 1-6 and 17) in the reply filed on 7/10/08 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 7-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 – 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, lines 1-2, contains the limitation “producing a mesostructred film film”. Two typos are believed to be present, first “mesostructred” is misspelled and should be “mesostructured”. And secondly the word “film” is repeated. As such the examiner is interpreting “producing a mesostructred film film” as “producing a mesostructured film”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1-6: wherever “mesostructred” appears in these claims (which is throughout the claims) the examiner is interpreting this as a misspelling for “mesostructured”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention

Art Unit: 1792

was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stucky (WO 99/37705; hereafter Stucky) in view of Nogues et al (US patent 5,076,980; hereafter Nogues) and Miyata et al. ("Alignment of Mesoporous Silica on a Glass Substrate by a Rubbing Method" Chem. Mater. V11 (1999) 1609 – 1614; as provided in applicant's IDS dated 9/29/05; hereafter Miyata).

Claim 1-6, and 17: Stucky teaches a method for manufacturing a mesoscopically ordered, mesoporous structured films and monoliths (of metal oxides such as SiO₂, SnO₂, etc) (abstract, pg 18 lines 20 – pg 19 line 30, pg 36 line 24 – pg 37 line7) comprising the steps of:

preparing a reactant solution that contains a metal precursor material for forming mesostructured films and monoliths which contain a metal oxide (see, for example, TEOS (pg 36 line24 – pg 37 line7), or metal chlorides (such as, SnCl₄, listed in pg 65, Table 3)) and amphiphilic materials such as a non-ionic surfactant (see, for example, C₁₆H₃₃(OCH₂CH₂)₁₀OH (C₁₆EO₁₀) (cetyl hydrophobic group) and numerous other non-ionic alkyl polyethylene oxide (polyoxyethylene-ether) surfactants (pg 38 lines 21 –30, pgs 63-64, Table 2) or amphiphilic poly(alkylene oxide) block copolymers (see, for example, PEO-PPO-PEO pg 18 lines 20 – pg 19 line 30));

applying the reaction solution onto a substrate by a process such as spin-, drop-, or dip-casting (see, for example, (pg 36 line 24 – pg 37 line7), (pg 42 lines 8 – 23)).

Stucky teaches an aging time to allow the solution to gel, and drying of gel (see, for example, (pg 42 lines 8 – 23)). Stucky further teaches that in the processes of

Art Unit: 1792

forming these mesoporous films and monoliths, synthetic conditions such as the humidity can be modified to impact the resulting structure of the film (pg 46 lines 5 – 13), thereby recognizing humidity as a result effective variable. Also Stucky mentions that modifications including additional heat treatments following gelation can produce harder materials that are less likely to crack, but Stucky is silent as to the specifics of such treatments (pg 39 lines 1 – 7), so Stucky does not explicitly teach forming the mesostructured film at a temperature of 100°C or less in a vapor-containing atmosphere at a relative humidity in a range of from 40% to 100%. Nogues teaches a two-part drying step where the first-step of the process involves placing a gelled sol-gel (from a TEOS precursor) in an oven at a relatively low temperature (40-80°C), the heating further (from 40-100°C) at relative humidity typically between about 50-100% (col 5 lines 33 – 39, col 6 lines 7 – 21). This hydrated heat treatment is conducted to reduce the amount of drying-induced cracking that occurs during the drying of sol-gel precursors (col 1 lines 44 – 64, col 2 lines 25 – 37). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated a preliminary heating-treatment step involving holding the sol gel in vapor containing high humidity environment of between 50-100% RH, at 40-100°C as taught by Nogues, into the process of forming a sol-gel derived coating, as taught Stucky, as Stucky describes humidity as result effective variables for his process, as well as introducing additional heat treatments, but is silent as to specific conditions of each, and Nogues teaches the conditions of a high humidity treatment step that will lessen the occurrence of drying-induced cracking of a sol-gel.

Art Unit: 1792

Stucky in view of Nogues teaches all the features of these claims except for the limitations directed to the substrate having a capability of / and orienting an aggregate of the amphiphilic material in a predetermined direction. Stucky further teaches that the reaction solution can be applied onto a substrate (such as glass) by a process such as spin-, drop-, or dip-casting (see, for example, (pg 36 line 24 – pg 37 line7), (pg 42 lines 8 – 23)). Miyata teaches a method of preparing a film of mesoporous material (silica, from a TEOS / surfactant reactant solution) on a coated glass substrate (see, for example, pg 1609-1610, Abstract, and “Experimental Section”). The glass substrate is provided with a polyimide film that is treated with rubbing which gives alignment control to the substrate, which is taught as desirable in that it provides an ordered mesoporous films with aligned channels (see, for example, pg 1610, first col, and “Experimental Section”). The result of the film formation process is an aligned structured with oriented channels aligned with respect to the substrate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated using a glass substrate provided with a precoating of a rubbed polymer film, as taught by Miyata, as the glass substrate taught in the method of Stucky in view of Nogues as it would provide a desirable ordered alignment of the for the mesostructured / mesoporous coating. Such an incorporation would result in a method which would possess a substrate having a capability of orienting aggregate of the amphiphilic material, and one wherein aggregates of the amphiphilic material would be oriented in the predetermined (rubbing) direction.

Claim 17: Stucky further teaches removing the amphiphilic material to form a pore (see, for example, calcination step, pg 42 lines 19 - 23).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 and 17 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, and 7 of copending Application No. 11/267156 (hereafter ‘156) in view of Miyata.

Claims 1-4, 17: ‘156 teaches a method of producing a mesostructured film comprising a reaction solution containing a precursor material (such as tin chloride) for a mesostructured film which contains a metal oxide, and an amphiphilic material (surfactant) (claims 1, 2, 4)

Claims 5 and 6: '156 teaches the step involving holding the substrate in a vapor containing atmosphere is performed at a temperature of 100°C or less at a relative humidity in a range of from 40% to 100% (claims 3 and 7)

'156 teaches all the features of these claims except for the limitations directed to the substrate having a capability of / and orienting an aggregate of the amphiphilic material in a predetermined direction, and an actual recitation of removing the amphiphilic material to form a pore. These remaining limitations are taught by Miyata. Miyata teaches a method of preparing a film of mesoporous material (silica, from a TEOS / surfactant reactant solution) on a coated glass substrate (see, for example, pg 1609-1610, Abstract, and "Experimental Section"). The glass substrate is provided with a polyimide film that is treated with rubbing which gives alignment control to the substrate, which is taught as desirable in that it provides an ordered mesoporous films with aligned channels (see, pg 1610, first col, and "Experimental Section"). The result of the film formation process is an aligned structured with oriented channels aligned with respect to the substrate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated using a substrate provided with a precoating of a rubbed polymer film, as taught by Miyata, as the substrate in '156 as it would provide a desirable ordered alignment of the for the mesostructured / mesoporous coating. Although '156 has not explicitly taught removing the amphiphilic material to form a pore, it has taught forming a mesoporous material which is formed with an amphiphilic material (claim 1), and Miyata has further taught the removal of surfactant forms pores (see, for example, experimental section).

Art Unit: 1792

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

As relied upon for above rejections, the examiner is putting Ogawa et al PGPub 2006/00057296 on record as it is the publication of application 11/267156.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NATHAN H. EMPIE whose telephone number is (571)270-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00- 4:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on (571) 272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1792

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. H. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Katherine A. Bareford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792